

376  
Pam. C/5  
60684

*The* Lancashire LEVITE Rebuk'd:

O R,

A F A R T H E R

VINDICATION

O F T H E

DISSENTERS

F R O M

P O P E R Y, S U P E R S T I T I O N,

I G N O R A N C E and K N A V E R Y ;

Unjustly Charged on Them,

B Y

**Mr. Zachary Taylor,**

In his Two Books about the

**SUREY DEMONIACK.**

---

In a Second *LETTER* to Himself.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed by R. J. and Sold by A. Baldwin, near the  
*Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane.* 1698.

THE LANCET AND THE LANCET

OF THE

INDICATOR

DISSEMINATED

BY THE

LANCET

AND THE

OF THE

LANCET

OF THE

LANCET

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



---

# P R E F A C E.

Mr. TAYLOR,

I Received your LETTER, May 2. To Your Apostate Friend, N. N.

Sir, I was much startled at the first sight of the Direction, and wondered who it should be, that was become an Apostate. And I thought of all those Persons I had heard of, who were reputed the Authors of the Letter, called, *The Lancashire Levite Rebuk'd*: thought I, is there any of them turn'd Turk, or Papist? I never heard any such thing. But may be Mr. T. thinks the Author is quite gone from the Communion of the C. of E. because he could not Pray with them formerly, *That God would Strengthen K. J. in the true Worshipping, &c.* But this, I can assure you, is not so. For I can now keep on my Knees at that Petition for K. W. (tho' some others will not) and heartily say, *We beseech thee to bear us, good Lord.*

But I was presently satisfied, this was not the Reason; but, because *I had denied my Christian Name.*

My first Wonder then ceased, but a second arose in its stead; that you should say, *That I had denied my Christian Name, or at least were ashamed of it.*

Pray Mr. T. When was the Time, where was the Place, who was the Person, to whom I deny'd my Christian Name?

I remember not that I ever did deny it, &c. I have not been Re-Baptized, nor taken a new Name, nor am I ashamed of that which was given me in Baptism.

But I confess, I concealed my Name in my Letter to you. And if it will please or pleasure you, I'll give you some Reasons, why (tho' the Fortune of *Cesar* or *Pompey* be not concerned therein) I concealed it.

1. To avoid the Blows of the contending Parties. For it's often the Fate of them that interpose as Friend to both, not only to fail of their desired Success, to make them Friends; but to disoblige both, and to make themselves more Enemies of those, who out of Kindness they endeavoured to



## P R E F A C E.

reconcile. And this I find too true from both Parties. But, *Am I become your Enemy, because I tell you the truth?* Gal. IV. 16.

2. I was not willing to disoblige you; for I feared, in some heat, upon the reading of your Book I might be so far transported, to give Words that I might find cause to repent of; for I am a Man subject to like Passions as you are. Yet (whatever Misapprehensions you may have of me) I have a greater Respect for your Self, and another angry Man that spits Fire against Dissenters, than I doubt I can make you believe. And it was your tart Censures and Reflections upon Dissenters, that extorted from me some Expressions, that you may think are not friendly.

And for these Reasons, and another you have in my P. S. I gave you to understand, *That if any unbecoming Words had overslipped me, I beg'd your Pardon.* Pag. 28.

In this I hope I shall treat you with all the Civility that is meet for your Character, (tho' there are many Provocations;) and some Epithets in my former, &c. I wish were expunged. And I was really concerned, soon after it was out of my Hands, because having occasion to go to *Manchester*, I there in Discourse heard a very Learned and Judicious Man, no Dissenter, commend a Sermon you had Preached there. So I was troubled, lest any thing in my latter should be an Occasion of lessening your Reputation, and so be a Prejudice to your Ministry.

But after I understood, That others less Judicious were offended at your Sermon, because, they said, it was like a *Presbyterian Sermon*. These were the High Tories and Jacobites, who called you *Taylor Upon Titus*. Such Blades there are, that nothing pleaseth them that is serious.

Again, I have been told, that your Father was sometimes Hasty, (as we say) but his Passion was soon over: insomuch, that a Man-Servant that lived with him would say, *I am glad when my Master gives me a Lauke*, (a Lancash. Word, which you understand) *for I am sure presently after have a Piece of Silver from him.* And I supposed you might be of the like Constitution, the Sign of a good Nature, as we say. Therefore I concealed my Name, that I might not provoke to that you might afterward see cause to be troubled at, and could not be remedied; for, --- *Litera scripta manet.*

3. I did also conceal my Name, to avoid the Ill-will of such as might mistake any thing in it, towards my Person. And to prevent the Censures of all, and to save my self the trouble of Answering impertinent Questions; and avoid the fruitless Discourse of one or other about the Letter.

4. Possibly there might be some Apprehensions of Club-Law from some Malignant Spirits, by *Innuendo's*; remembering poor *De Laune*, Mr. Baxter, &c. and what you had said about *Crab-tree*. And if this do



## P R E F A C E.

do not satisfy why I conceal my Name, I want not want Examples of Good Men; amongst whom I know you will, with me, own the *Author of The Whole Duty of Man*, to be one.

Mr. T. you hint at another Reason, why I am an Apostate, *Because I chang'd the Presbyter into Levite.*

For this I must tell you, I did not know of that Title, 'till I heard of it by a Friend, who had it from *Ephraim Johnston*, for whom your Letter is Printed, nor saw it, 'till the Letter came down Printed.

Mr. T. the next thing you blame me for, is, *That I make Persona Reflections upon the Morals of Men that are dead*; for, *De Mortuis nil nisi Bonum.* To this I say:

1. Your Maxim is not universally to be observed. For then we must have no Histories of Bad Mens Lives, and Vices, to deterr the Living from such Enormities, as the Dead have been guilty of.

2. I must give you to understand, That it's ill Chidden, for your Reflections upon the Dead. *Hildersham* and *Jesse, Bee*, and 17, for ought I know, Worthy Men gave me the Occasion to reflect on *W.C.* in Vindication, not only of Dissenters, but the *C. of E.* *Lev. p. 18, 19.* and you have done it in with a Witness in this Letter to *Mr. Pendlebury*, in Words at length, and not in Figures. Whereas I did but put two Letters, which could not affect him much farther, than where he was known, or the Places where he acted his Villanies.

3. I did it in Faithfulness: To intimate to the Reverend *B. of C.* for future Caution; for I heard a Dissenter say, he had sent the *B. Word* by a Rev. Divine, *That it was not for his Honour, to permit such a one as W.C. in a Place, which he supposed, was in his Own Gift.* I am perswaded that Ingenious Man forgot to tell him.

But I know not how to excuse some; that are more peculiarly called in the Canon Law *The B. Eyes*, who knew of his Tricks immediately before he went to *Motteram*, and (I doubt) were not faithful to that Good Man. And therefore I am still of the same Mind, in pitying the worthy *B. B.* that cannot see at distance without others Eyes, &c. *Lev. p. 18.*

And thus I have acquitted my self from Blame, for reflecting on the Morals of *W. C.* tho' dead. Besides, his were Villanies notorious; not like your Insinuations, which follow to be considered.

You say, *Should I engage you my Friend, upon the same Ground that you do W.C. I could name as many of your Ministers, and put C's and N's to them too, who are yet alive, that labour under the same Guilt, &c.* And so you threaten the Living and the Dead; but for the Dead, you will be modest. *De Mortuis.*

But for the Living, you are very free of your Blows, and are prepared for more.

But



## P R E F A C E.

But had you not need to consider well before-hand, whether it be lawful or convenient for your self to cast Firebrands, lest some should fall upon your own *House* or *Head*, and you not be able to quench it. Yet if you have a Mind of *Billingsgate-Stuff*, let me as a Friend advise you, not to be too rash, but look to it; that it be for the Honour of God, and the Service of the Church, and your own Reputation; and that it be *true*, and *well attested*; remembering, *your own*, and every other Man's Name and Reputation is in another Man's Hand and Power. And that there have been, and are evil Surmisings, and groundless Suspicions, which are mischievous, and of ill consequence; and that many a Good Man hath suffered unjustly, and been heavily burthened under it, tho' innocent; as the Learned *Hooker*, that wrote the *Ecclesiastical Policy*, &c. and that if it be not true, you can make no Restitution. And supposing it should be true, it may be it was secret, and not scandalous; and it may be (if Persons be old) it's long since repented of, and never reiterated.

These evil Surmises and invidious Reflections, are an Indication of a corrupt and rotten Heart, and of a weak Cause; and the Persons whose Cause, and in whose Excuse you Threaten, cannot be Justified by a Recrimination: and this might beget a Recrimination with *Letters* in some angry Persons, that might think themselves touched. And indeed it's to be lamented, that there may be found too many Instances.

There are some yet living, no mean Clergy-Men, guilty in that kind. And if I loved a Stink, it's easy to tell you of one that was worse than Gr. and L. that never Married the Party. And in another Case, to Parallel your Story of Mr. *Pendlebury*; (as true, as that he Married his Wife without Parents consent,) whose Name lives, and will, when others shall be written in the Earth. I can tell you of one, who gave himself the Title of A. M. to his Patron, when on Enquiry he proved Undergraduate. But I hope he hath long since repented of all; and I hear he Preaches well, and lives well; and therefore I'll not give so much as one Letter of his Name.

But there is another Old Stallion, that could not be content with his own Wife; that neither lived *caste*, nor *caute*; but his Miscarriage was Brought unto, and Sworn before a Justice of Peace. But alas! what's all this to the Matter in Hand? I'll leave him also without a *Letter*; to stand or fall to his own Master; the Lord give him Repentance.

Yet I am grieved to think, what Work such Stuff as this makes among the Prophane; what Sport they make over their Glasse and Cups; and hence take occasion to lessen their own Crimes, and grow Impudent; and make a Mock of their own and others Sins; which is, or should be, the Grief all Good Men.

For My Own Part, I fear GOD, but I fear not many of your Reflections.



## C H A P. I.

### Dissenters Not Guilty of Popery.

**I**N the Letter, which somebody (I know not who) Intituled, *The Lancashire Levite Rebuk'd*, I undertook to Vindicate Dissenters from the Charge of Popery, or Errours looking that Way.

Mr. T. you seem to deny your Charge in Pag. 45. of your *Letter to Apost. Fr.* for you say, *My Friend either could not find one place in all my Book, to fix the Charge on; or else he found it so fully proved, that he saw it necessary to connive at it.* And you farther say, *You own Dissenting Ministers were Tools of Popery. And this was all I charged them with, upon this Head of Popery.* Pag. 5.

Mr. T. you are in so much haste, that you have overlooked or forgotten your Charge; therefore I shall take leave, (lest I should be thought to bear false Witness against you) to shew you, This was not all you charged them withal. But I'll tell you,

1. What you charge them with *more of Popery.*
2. How they are acquitted in my Letter. For which you say, *I have the Impertinence to ask, What Errours in Doctrine, looking that Way?* in your Pag. 5.

1. Your Charge of Popery, is in the first Lines of your Preface, next after your Names; and it's in these Words, *The Foundation, whereof I am an unworthy Member, being intended for the Preservation of His Majesty's Subjects from falling into Errours, especially such as tend to Popery. And a late Scandalous Pamphlet, intituled, The Surey Demoniack, looking that Way, &c.* Here is your Charge.

2. I now shew you, how I endeavoured to discharge them.

1. By taking notice, you did not prosecute your own Charge put in against them; for you Indict them of *Errours* tending to Popery; and when you should Prove, you Drop your Charge, and bring no Evidence. So they are in course acquitted. But the Defendants not satisfied, expect the Accuser should acknowledge his Fault, for Scandalizing of them. And to clear themselves, they put in their Plea, and prove themselves Not Guilty; by Answering the particular Instances, that can be thought could affect the Case. And therefore,

2. I anticipated what I thought could be said against the Dissenters, and only two things could with any Reason be objected. 1. Either that they



they held some Errours in Doctrine. 2. Or, that they practised some things *tending that Way*; viz. Towards Popery.

Now if you prove neither, the Bill ought to be quasht; and so you come under the Crimination *your self*, which you would have fixed on *me*; of *Bearing False Witness*.

Now for Errours in Doctrine, the Matter was soon over, being none was objected in particular. And I suppose you did not expect that I should find any tending to Popery, when your self could find none; tho' you had charg'd their Book with such Errours.

3. I enquired what they had done, that tended altogether towards Popery; here you lay in a particular Charge.

1. That they were constant Tools of *Papists* and Popery.

2. They Pray'd on Supposition; and such Praying justifying the *Papists* Prayers to Saints.

*Objection.* You object, they are *constant Tools of Popery*. And for my Information, you bring a Book called *Philanax Anglicus*; to prove, They Cut off the *Royal Martyr's* Head. *Pag. 5.*

*Solution.* I answer, excepting against the Witness a *Papist*. We have Mischief too much from such villanous Witnesses, who account nothing unlawful to say or do against Hereticks, to promote the Catholick Cause.

This Book was written, with a Design to cast the *Odium* of K. Ch. I. on the Prorestants; except some few, whom he calls (if I remember right) *Protestants of Integrity*: I suppose he may mean such as B. Goodman, Parker of Oxf. or Barrow; to whom add, if you will, your Dr. Heylin.

This Book was Answered so well by Dr. Owen, that he was highly Caresed by some Great Ministers of State in King Charles the Second's Time; that for certain were no *Dissenters*.

But if you except against him, as a Party, I shall refer you to a Canon of *Canterbury* in the same Reign; and Chaplain to K. Ch. II. Dr. Peter du Moulin, who Answered that Book, and calls it *Purum putum Mendacium*, Right Metal of Untruth; and calls the Author, *Philepapa*; and Dedicates it to the then B. of London, Sheldon.

Now would you not be angry, if I should call you Tool of Popery; because from them you derive your Authority to call *Dissenters* so.

Again, you refer me to a Book, I suppose, called *Foxes and Firebrands*; an Author, may be, of the same Kidney.

Now to be even with you, I have already given you two for two; and to gratify you, I'll add a third, viz. King Charles the Second's Declaration or Proclamation, appointed to be Read in Churches Annually, before Jan. XXX.

*Obj.* But you send me also to fresher Instances; to prove, that  
Dissen-



*Dissenters* are Tools of Popery; viz. *Addresses* and *Speeches* to the late K. J. *Solut.* I will refer you to Cart-loads of *Addresses*, and *Abhorrences*, and *Sermons*, *Cursings*, *Exclusioners*, and their Posterities; which may be as much worth, as *Dissenters Addresses* and *Speeches*.

Besides, you may add if you will, R. Rev. and Rev. *Caresses* and *Speeches* at *Chester*, and the Clergy meeting him also. And whose Tools were they? I am ashamed to name these things, but you extort them. *Dat veniam Corvis.*

Now how should *Dissenters* please some Fools? One while they are the *Papists* Tools, for their Disloyalty; and in the next Breath, they are Tools for their Loyalty.

Now since the happy Establishment of King *William* on the Throne, I suppose you and *Dissenters* are agreed in your Loyalty. But some *Jacobite* would, if he durst, ask you, How you could dispence with your Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive-Obedience, and your Subscription, *That it's not Lawful*, &c. But *Dissenters* do heartily Bless God for such a Revolution.

And for Mr. *Jolly's* Speech, and *Dissenters* *Addresses* at that Time you mention; there was none presented, nor did Mr. J. make a Speech.

2. Farther, I had said, *Lev. pag. 9. What are they to be Blamed for? Are they to be Blamed for their Fasting and Praying? Did they use Popish Exorcisms, or Popish Ceremonies?*

Now to prove they had done nothing to be Blamed for, in their *Fasting* and *Praying*; because whether it was a Cheat, or whether it was a Natural Distemper, yet they supposing and believing here was a Devil, and the Man really being under a great Affliction, they Fasted and Prayed; (according to the Advice of St. *James*, Chap. V. *If any be afflicted, let him Pray.*) And what is here to be Blamed, or what was here done tending to Popery? Now what say you now?

1. You blame their Prayers, because they were upon a Supposition; and would justify *Papists* Prayers to Saints.

2. You charge me with misrepresenting your Words, and with Fabulous Stories.

*Obj.* You say, *If the Supposition be false, the Worship is Superstition.* And by asserting this, *I am a Friend to Quakers and Papists, if a Supposition be the Ground of Devotion.* For *Papists* pay Adoration to the Sacrament of the Altar, on the belief that Christ is personally there; and they Pray to Saints and Angels, on supposition they can hear. Lett. to Apost. p. 6. With several impertinent Reflections, nothing to the Argument.

*Sol.* To this I say: 1. Mr. J. and the rest did not make a Supposition of it; for they did verily believe that D. was a Demoniack; and thought there were the same Symptoms with some Demoniack in the Gospel, which (I remember not that) you have offered any thing against.



2. But because I said, they Pray'd on that Supposition, that *Dugd.* was a Demoniack, they were not to be blamed therefore. I answer, *That all Worship upon a Supposition, is not Superstition.* For their Prayers were not Superstition: Because,

1. Their Prayers for *Dugd.* were to a lawful Object, God, in the Name of Christ; and not like the Papists Adoration of the Sacrament.

Now here some Fanatick would fall upon you, and say, Whether is more excusable, he that adores the Sacrament of the Altar, that believes Christ is there Personally, &c. or he that adores the Altar, or before it, when Christ is not there, either Personally or Representatively. Unless they suppose him there, when there is no reason to believe it, this indeed is Superstition with a Witness.

2. *Dissenters* Prayers were not only to a Lawful Object, but for a Lawful Thing; that God would release an afflicted Man, and one they thought a Demoniack, from the power of Satan. And that their Prayers were not Superstition upon this Supposition, may appear by alike Instances; as, suppose you be absent from your Wife and Children, I hope you Pray for them when at a distance, supposing and believing them to be alive; but it's possible at the same time some of them may be dead, and you know it not. Will this Supposition, which is not then true, make your Prayers Superstition?

K. Ch. II. was Pray'd for publickly after he was Dead, for it could not be known at this distance. Were your Publick Prayers then for him, Superstition?

Obj. 2. You charge me with misrepresenting your Words and Fabulous Stories, Pag. 5. because I had said, *That you deny, that a Natural or Preternatural Distemper can be attended with a Devil; and that it was no good Argument to prove that Dick's was no Possession, because a Distemper.* Lev. Pag. 7, 8.

Sol. 1. I did not say these particular Words were yours. But I'll tell you why I judg'd the *Argument* to be yours: 1. From P. 22. of *Sur. Imp.* to P. 28. you go about to prove *Dugd.*'s Fits to be a Cheat, or that there was nothing in his Fits, but what was Natural. Doth it not hence follow, that here was no Devil? Which to prove, you fetch in the Authority of Dr. Willis, Ratcliff, and Buckley. Ratcliff saith, Pag. 30. *These strange Gestures and Actions were not Diabolical, but Preternatural.* Whence you draw this Conclusion; *You see by the help of my good Friends, I may hope to parallel the Surey Gambals, and satisfy all unbiass'd Persons; from the Symptoms that attend Convulsive Distempers; of what? That for any Feats shewn by Dick, there was no necessity for, and therefore no reason to admit the presence of Rich. Ludicrous Daemon, to Play the Merry-Andrew.* *Sur. Imp.* Pag. 31.

Now this was either to prove from these *Medium's*, that it was



was a Cheat, or Natural Distemper, and therefore no *Dæmon*; or it was not.

1. If it was not, to what end was it produced? and what signifies your Authorities? For I have told you, it might be a Cheat and Combination, and yet a *Dæmon*; as in the Case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*; and be sure there was a Distemper, as in those *Demoniacks* in *Mat. 17.* and *Mark 9.* And if this was all you intended to prove, why do you lay such heavy Charges against the *Dissenters*, for believing here was a *Dæmon*; which you say, but do not yet prove, is an Imposture, and not to be believed to be a *Dæmon*; but a wild Story.

2. If it was to prove that there was no *Dæmon*, which your Words above seem to imply, then my Charge is not unjust.

And if your *Whalley-Sermon* advance the quite contrary Opinion, as you say, *Lett. p. 5.* which contrary Opinion is, if I mistake not, *That because a Distemper, therefore attended with a Devil; and that you affirm, that Natural and Preternatural Distempers may be attended with a Devil.* And if this be so, you quite give up the Cause. And why here might not be a *Dæmon*, (for you have no other Argument I can find) I yet understand not from you.

Thus you kindly gratify the *Dissenters*; and with the leave of your Concession, they may (if they please) still believe a *Surey-Demoniack*; only you severely treat them about Matters of Fact, and the manner of their Management of the Affair. And indeed, if you had in the *Spirit* of *Meekness*, blamed them for it, and admonished them as mistaken Brethren; (tho' you be not their *Diocesan*;) and not Hectored, and treated them with so much Scorn and Disdain, to render them and their Party contemptible, I would not have blamed you. But, *I admonish, I admonish, I admonish*; and then immediately, *Take them Derick*; I like not. Meekness and Forbearance, is better than a Word and a Blow. The Apostle's Canon is better. *Gal. 6. 1.*

## CHAP. II.

### Nor of Superstition.

HAVING vindicated *Dissenters* from your Charge of Errours tending to *Popery*, I proceed farther to vindicate them from your Charge of *Superstition*; which was undertaken, *Lev. Pag. 10, 11.*

Now you say I impute to you, *The charging Dissenters with*



Superstition, but produce not so much as one Place in all your Book, to Prove this Charge. Lett. pag. 6. To this, Mr. Taylor, hear my Defence.

I. I did, in the Lev. p. 10. give you part of the Words where you charge them with *Superstition*, in different Characters; and, but that I grudge the toil of transcribing your Sayings, I might have added more.

But now I will let the World have it. In your Preface, p. 1. *This Trade which you have learned from the Papists, was designed to ensnare honest and well-meaning, but easy People; (here you judge Hearts) for since neither you nor they can justify by Arguments, (here is their Ignorance) your Superstitions, (here is the present Charge) and Divisions from the Established Church; (here is the next Charge) you were forced to fly to little Shifts and Tricks, that by working on weak Peoples Fancies, you might win those to your Party by Craft and Wiles, (here's another Charge) which you could not by Reason and Religion.*

Now let any impartial Man judge, whether I, or you, my unfriendly Friend, are to be blamed. Is there no Word in all your Book, nor one Place to prove the Charge?

I think you are too young to need Spectacles, else I could very well afford to buy a pair, to read your own Book; provided I might be saved the trouble of Transcribing. But at last, you honestly confess the Charge, Lett. p. 6. but with some unmannerly Rhetorick, which is no Logick.

But you have a High Charge against me, Pag. 6. which I must not over-run; and it's no less than *BLASPHEMY*.

I perceive I must be at the drudgery of transcribing again, or else you will say, *I produce not one place in your Book, to Prove this*; and then they that read your Book, and not mine, will say I belye you. Now your Charge is this:

*I must rank him either amongst the Class of Ignoramus's, or I must make him to Blaspheme CHRIST: Lett. p. 6.*

Really Mr. T. I will give you leave to call me an *Ignoramus* a thousand times, rather than to Blaspheme Christ; tho' I should hear of it out of Pulpits and Coffee-Houses, &c. as once befel a Jury, because out of Compliment to their Superiours, they would not find innocent Persons guilty, were called *Ignoramus's*. And to make me Blaspheme, you never shall; I hope I should rather suffer my Tongue to be pull'd out of my Mouth. But I suppose you mean, you will prove me a Blasphemer.

And if that be it, put in your Charge, and I will answer.

And let's put it to an impartial Jury. O Yes! hear the Indictment.

*If the Greek Word δειδωμεν signify wholly, as he saith, a Fearing of Damons, or Worshipping of Devils; CHRIST himself being called*



called *δαίμων*, Acts 17. 18. Let him tell me, if according to his Exposition of it, the Fearing of Christ may not be expounded by Jews and Pagans, for worshipping of Devils. Lett. p. 6. And what then? Am I a Blasphemer? GOD Forbid!

Now Gentlemen, hear my Defence.

1. Take notice, he falsly accuseth me. I did not say the *Greek Word* signifieth wholly a Worshipping or Fearing of *Dæmons*. The Heathens did take it in a good sence, with respect to their own *Dæmons*, which they worshipped; yet in this very Place, Acts 17. 18. they took it in a bad sence, as a strange *Demon*; as when we say a False God; and Paul so took it, Verse 22.

2. I will yet tell you for once, seeing you ask it, *Whether Fearing of Christ, may not be expounded by Jews and Pagans, Worshipping of Devils?* I say, it may by them be so expounded, wickedly. Nay I'll tell you more; that they call Christ here, in Acts 17. 18. a *Demon*; and so did the *Jews*, Joh. 8. 48. But pray' Friend what's that to me, that *Jews* and *Pagans* blasphemously call Christ a *Demon*; or the Worshipping of Christ, the Worshipping of Devils? Did I ever call Christ a *Demon*?

3. Do you think that *Jews* and *Pagans* did rightly call Christ a *Demon*? Or is this one of his Names? (I hope, not to Bow the Knee to, when it's pronounc'd;) for then indeed your Accusation of *Blasphemy* might have had some Colour; and so to worship a *Demon*, might be to worship Christ. And then to have called the worshipping of Christ in a good sence, as a true Object of Worship, *A Worshipping of Devils*, would have been Blasphemy.

4. But again, if you think that Christ was properly and truly called a *Demon*, then Paul was as great a Blasphemer after his Conversion, as before: For he called the *Pagans* Worship, a Sacrificing to *Dæmons*, not to God; and he would not have the *Corinthians* have Fellowship with *Dæmons*. 1 Cor. 10. 10, 21.

What Paul! Would you not have Men to worship *Dæmons*? Why Christ is a *Demon*, and I hope we may worship Christ.

5. Now according to your Logick, you might very justly charge *Dissenters* with the greatest Villanies and Blasphemies.

What Wretches! offer to cast a *Demon* out of Dicky? Why Christ is a *Demon*, (by a very good Token, *Jews* and *Pagans* call him so, and used the word properly; for Mr. T. hath told you, Christ himself is so called, Acts 17. 18.) And cast out Christ?

So Paul comes under Correction, by such a Reason. What, have no Fellowship with *Dæmons*? Why Christ is a *Demon*; and must we not have Fellowship with him? (Is this the Reason, why some in the Pulpits cry out against *Dissenters*, for talking of Communion with Christ.)

Nay



Nay Christ himself will come under Correction of *Jews* and *Pagans*, and Mr. T. for he cast out a *Dæmon*: Did he cast out Himself? Such Divinity is like Christ Eating Himself.

And now Gentlemen, without Favour or Affection, Give in your Verdict, Whether am I, or my Accuser, more Guilty of Blasphemy?

I remember a Story (for a diversion) of a young Scholar in the University, when examined, what he remembred of a Sermon Preached by the Head of the Colledge; the said Head of the Colledge asked him, what was first, second, or third Grace that he had mentioned to one, being asked, What was my second Grace? the Boy answered, *Ignorance*: No, said he, *That's thy Grace, it's none of mine*. So I fear the *Blasphemy* will be Yours, not Mine.

Mr. T. I would not willingly lay any thing to your charge unjustly; and therefore I read, and read again, and thought to see if I could put any other more favourable Construction upon your Words; and I am apt to think, (in Charity to you) there is some Mistake, either in Writer or Printer.

But the Charge being of so high a nature, I cannot tell how it can be proved in what you have said, but by this meaning, which is partly expressed, and partly necessarily implied in your Words, without forcing of them into Nonsense.

And if I mistake, I will once more beg your Pardon, (provided you quit me of so heinous a Crime) altho' you very unkindly denied me once before, when I desired it. For I perceive your Pardons are as hard to be obtained for Love, as Popish Indulgences, or an Absolution for some Folks *without Money*; unless it be to *Scotch Converts*.

One thing more, under this Head.

I did tell you, that some Persons would retort upon you the Charge of *Superstition*; for doing things in the Worship of God, which are neither commanded by G O D or Men; and are not necessary Circumstances of Decency or Order.

And it was Queried; *Where are you commanded, to Bow to the East? or before the Altar to make Curt'sies? Where commanded to stand up at Te DEUM, Benedictus, Magnificat; or at Reading of Psalms? and bouncing and racketing, Priest one Verse, and People another? is this for Edification? Lev. p. 11.*

I have sought for an Answer, but yet find none; for which in Civility I thank you, for easing me of so much Pains, of transcribing your Answer, and Replying; which I could easily have done, by the very Authority of a B.'s *Articles of Enquiry*, into these Crimes before-mentioned, and some other *Probation-Ceremonies* of the same nature.

Farther, doth not he transgress a Rule or Canon, that goes *beyond* what's commanded, as he that comes short? Else, what a Gap would  
this



this open to an Inundation of Heathenish and Popish Rites, in the Worship of G O D, and all the Offices therein?

For why not Salt, Spittle, and Cream, and Chrism in Baptism? Why not Crossing upon Crossing in all Parts of Divine Worship? and many other ridiculous Popperies used in the Church of *Rome*. And for ought I know, if the Parson, Vicar, or Curate have a mind to use them, he may do it as lawfully, as Bow at the Altar, Stand-up at *Te Deum*, &c. and Racket the Psalms; which are no way for Edification, nor are commanded by the Ch. of *Engl*.

And now I think I have cleared my Self from being a *False Accuser* and *Blasphemer*, and *Dissenters* from *Superstition*.

And leave you to vindicate your Self, or those that use Uncommanded Rites and Ceremonies, from the Crime of *Superstition*. Rom. II. 1.

And if Silence to what was offered in the *Lev*. be Consent, I know on what Hand *Superstition* lyes, by your Consent.

### C H A P. III.

#### Nor of Schismatical Divisions.

NOW I proceed to your Charge of *Divisions*; and am glad, you have once Acknowledged, That I Charge you not Unjustly.

I endeavoured to Clear them from Sinful, Schismatical *Divisions*: And what say you to it?

You say, *I pretend not to Vindicate them; as in other Cases, from the Guilt of it; but endeavour to justify them in it.* Lett. p. 7.

To this I say:

1. It's true thus far, That I vindicate them not from some Divisions; but justify them: *i. e.* Going to another Place, from your Church of *Wigan* to *Billinge-Chapel* or *St. Elms*. for I think I need not, I understand no Crime in either; and I gave you my Reason.

2. I justify them from Divisions in Doctrine, from the Establish'd Church; for they Subscribe all the Articles concerning Doctrine, and do not Preach against them when they have done. And so they divide not from you in Doctrine.

Obj. But *Corah, Dathan and Abiram, &c. did Subscribe all the Articles of the Jewish Faith.* P. 8. And what then?

Sol. 1. I have very often heard of these three Men, (as pertinently may be, as that of Rebellion being Witchcraft, which was *Saul's Sin*;) and



and I think them as bad Men as you can. But if really they Subscribed the Articles of the *Jewish* Faith, then in *That* they were neither Hereticks nor Schismatics.

2. *Dissenters* say, They separate not from their *Lawful Church-Governours*; and 'till they be proved *such Separatists*, they are not to be charged with sinful Divisions.

*Obj.* But you call their Conventicles *Schismatical*, P. 20. *Sur. Imp.* and their Divisions, *Unchristian*. P. 69. *Ibid.*

*Sol.* You may call their Conventicles what you please; but it's one thing to say, and another to prove: For I remember not any thing *Steely* enough to force such a Conclusion, and *Flinty* Words will not do it.

*Obj.* Again, you are about it, and about it; and say, *Hark my Friend, are not your Divisions Unchristian? Do not your Conventicles make a Division? and so are Schismatical; for these are both one.*

*Sol.* Here's Learning, to puzzle Dissenters; but I dare venture it with some of the *Lower Classes* in Mr. *Frank.* Academy to Answer; will he not presently say, *Syllogizari non est ex Particulari.*

Then I'll venture to tell you, that *All Divisions* are not *Unchristian*, nor *Schismatical*; for if so, then they that in this Diocese divide from *Chester-Cathedral*, and go to worship God in other Churches and Chapels, are *Unchristian* and *Schismatical*. But I suppose you have some other Meaning.

*Obj.* But, *Its Dissenters Divisions are Schismatical and Unchristian.*

*Sol.* 1. In Answer to this I had given, *Lev. p. 12.* A Learned Man, no Dissenter, had call'd Schism an *Ecclesiastical Scare-crow*, and you call him a *Socinian*. But what's that to Dissenters? He was certainly a Ch. of E. Man. And let him be *Socinian*, *Arminian*, *Calvinist*, *Papist*, *Millenary*, in Doctrine; if he hath but a large Swallow, and can but Subscribe the Articles in Dr. *Bramhall's*, and some others new-invented Sence; and say he doth it *Ex Animo*, he is no Schismatick. And yet Heretick and Schismatick seem with St. *Paul* to be the same, 1 *Cor. 11.* And if Dissenters durst but say what they believe not, they would be no Schismatics.

2. I told you, *Lev. p. 12.* That I had often heard and read, Protestants excuse themselves from the Guilt of *SCHISM*, which the Church of *Rome* charges them with, as you do Dissenters. *Because that Church required as Terms of Communion, things doubtful, unlawful, and sinful*; and make the Papists the Schismatics, who are the culpable Cause of Divisions; and produce *Rom. 16. 17.*

And I am apt to think, that if those that have the Rule in the Church would impose no other *Terms of Communion*, but what Christ the chief Ruler hath enjoined, all serious Christians would live in *Unity*, tho' not in every thing in *Uniformity*. And what Authority any have, to impose more than Christ hath, I am yet to seek. And



And this would be a Means to take away all Causes of Divisions, amongst the Pious, and Humble, and Charitable CHRISTIANS.

But for the Prophane, Irreligious, and Immoral, they will readily comply with that Party which either indulgeth them in their Lusts; or are most easy in overlooking, or censuring their Crimes.

And if any others be unruly, in breaking that Unity and Concord which Christ hath bounded, let the Pastors of the Churches, according to Christ's appointment, make use of the Spiritual Sword committed to them; and then, *Valeat, quantum valere potest.*

And for those Enormities peculiarly under the Jurisdiction of the Civil Magistrate, let them use their Sword, for the Punishment of Evil-doers.

3. Dissenters think the Protestants Arguments against the Church of Rome, will justify their present partial Withdrawing from the Ch. of E. And of this their General Argument you take no notice, tho' you had said, *They cannot by Arguments justify their Divisions.* Pref. p. 1. Surey Imp.

The Ch. of E. have it in their Power at any time, to remove the Schism so much complain'd of. *Take but away all that Christ hath not commanded, as Terms of Communion, and the Schism ceases.* - And it's hard, that Men should make those things Sin, which God hath not.

## CHAP. IV.

### Nor of Ignorance.

**T**HE next Charge. *They cannot by Arguments justify their Divisions from the Establish'd Church.* In Answer to this, two things were said in the Lev.

1. Many Dissenters do not totally divide from the Establish'd Church; they frequent their Publick Assemblies, hear the Word, join in their Prayers, and *some* in the Lord's Supper, and in all things that Christ hath enjoynd as Terms of Communion; and leave them only in those things they think to be unlawful; that are of meer Humane Institution.

2. It was also said, That Dissenters are not so *ignorant*, but they have something to say for themselves. And four Arguments were produced. And what do you say?

1. You acknowledge, *You charge them home with Ignorance.* Pag. 12. and, *That you are still of the same Mind.* And give your Reasons, why you charged them with Ignorance; because they could not understand *Arabick* Characters, and some Cyphers, and suffered a Female-Friend to be call'd *Ishcol*; and at last you crow, *What saith my Friend?* Profound Silence! And you say true in that: for I never undertook to



meddle with Matters of Fact. And it was only undertaken to vindicate them from Ignorance in matter of Argument, to prove that they can justify themselves from the Charge of Divisions, &c.

But for Matters of Fact, I am still of the same Mind, and I will not meddle, tho' you call me *Ignoramus* for it; but shall leave it to Mr. C. and you, if you think it worth the while to wrangle it out; for such Pedantry is no way edifying to me.

2. But what say you to their Arguments? I am content here to attend a Tryal of Skill.

*Obj.* 1. Their first Argument was: *They cannot think it lawful for any body to command things in the Worship of God, of the same nature, use, significancy and end, with God's own Appointments; when there is no difference, but God Commands the one, and Men the other; and make them necessary Terms of Communion. And they instance in the Cross about Baptism, a Humane Sacrament. Lev. p. 12.*

*Sol.* To this you say: 1. *If I knew not the Doctrine of the Church of Eng. I am still an Ignoramus; if I do know, 'tis a damnable Scandal. I shall be now gored sure, with the one Horn; yet I'll go on, here's yet no Blood. Of this afterward.*

2. *They calling the Cross a Humane Sacrament, you are in a Huff, and cry out, A Humane Sacrament!—Prythee Friend talk Sense.*

*Repl.* I reply, pray you Friend be not too hasty; I perceive you know not who you speak to. But I'll not take ill your Familiarity, provided you will have Patience to hear my Defence. For I cannot easily be persuaded I talk Nonsense; if I find I have done so, I'll ask Dissenters Pardon, for representing their Arguments in Nonsense; and it shall be hard but you and I will part Friends about this Matter.

Mr. T. Why may not I, betwixt you and me, call the Cross a Humane Sacrament?

1. You are Book-learned, and therefore know the general Notion of a Sacrament; you know in the *Greek* it signifies a *Mystery*, and amongst the *Latins* it was a Military Term, something like our *Press-Money*. Now suppose I should say, there are Sacraments *Humane*, *Divine*, and *Diabolical*, I hope you would not again accuse me of Blasphemy.

Now the Heathens Mysteries and Sacraments were Diabolical, because instituted by the Devil, who enjoined them by his Oracles.

The *Romans* Sacraments of old were Humane, whereby they engaged their Soldiers; tho' may be sometimes, by some of their Religious Ceremonies, as an Oath for Confirmation. However, they were but of Mens Institution.

But there are other Sacraments amongst *Christians*, of which Two are of Divine Institution. But pray what are the other Five, which the *Papists* add? Why will you not admit them to be Sacraments? Is not one Reason,



Reason, because they are but of Humane Institution? And what Contradiction in Terms, if they be called Humane Sacraments? At best, the Cross is Divine in its End, Use and Significancy, but Humane in its Institution.

But if that Term will not yet please, I told you we would yet part Friends, or it shall be your Fault; for I love not to contend *de Lana Caprina*. Therefore, if you will, call it a *Humane Appointment*; and then, *Is it lawful for any body to command things in the Worship of God, of the same nature? &c.*

*Obj.* 1. And now Dissenters say, the Cross is such a Humane Appointment; and how do you answer this?

*Sol.* I might have found the Cross in Baptism to be no Humane Sacrament, if I would have consulted Can. 30. p. 14. say you.

*Repl.* Sir, I am not so prejudiced against the C. of E. but I will very willingly hear what she can say for her self; yea I would justify her as far as I am able. And if you knew me, I think you would not be so harsh in your Censures of me. Therefore that I might not be partial or unjust, I did consult her *Rubrick*, and *Offices*, and *Canons*, particularly Can. 30. and this you will find anon.

*Obj.* 2. Their second Argument was, *They think it not lawful* (some of them) *to kneel in receiving the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper.*

*Sol.* To this you say, *My Friend is bewildred, &c.* and you ask me a very important Question, *Do the Papists receive Wine in that Sacrament?*

Now for this time, rather than fall out with you, I'll answer you, The Papists do receive Wine in that Sacrament, unless the Priests be no Papists? Just such a Learned Question once was asked, in as good earnest as yours. Pray' Sir, will you tell me one thing; What's that? Is the Pope a Papist? Am I now bewildred?

Having told you of *Dissenters* Offence at Kneeling, I thought good to conceal their Argument; not that they are *contemptible*, but that I *durst not Vouch for them*; and so eased you of the trouble of Answering them: Yet desired *modestly* your help to answer one thing I had heard some of them object, which I could not answer my self.

*Obj.* The thing was this. *Some of them think it hard, that for doing, or offering to do as the Apostles did at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they should be peremptorily denied that Ordinance: When by the same Reason, if the Apostles were on Earth, and offered to do as they did, even in the Presence, and with the Approbation of their Master, they must be denied it.*

Now really Mr. T. you are very unkind here; for you give me no help to answer them; but twit me with my Ignorance, when I had confessed it in this Case; and had told you, I was not able to answer them. Was this *ingenuous*? When in earnest, I would have thanked you, according to promise. But what say you to this Scruple of *Dissenters*?



*Sol.* You cry, *A sad Story! if it be true*; and is this all? No, here's more. *When-ever you can prove that the Apostles used the Posture that the Presbyterians now do, I will engage our Church shall indulge you and your Brethren in the capricious Liberty of their pretended Consciences.* Really, a great and kind Undertaking. For my self, you know, I need not the Indulgence; but I should be glad of it, for honest *Dissenters* sake. Yet I much question the Performance. For, if you should give it to any that Kneel not, the Penalty is *Suspension*, by *Can. 27.* And I doubt you would scarce run such a Hazard, for the capricious Scruplers.

*Repl.* Yet I fancy the *Presbyterians* will say, *They do use the same Posture, for they Sit*: Which was their Table-Gesture.

You will say, I know the Apostles Posture was Discumbency; or a kind of Leaning and Lolling in one another's Bosom. But again they will say, Whatever the Manner was, whether cross-leg'd, or with their Feet under them, or Leaning sideways on their Elbow, still it was *Sitting* however.

Yet still my Scruple remains. *For if Christ's Apostles were now on Earth, and would receive it in the same Gesture they did receive it from their Master, and not Kneel, they must be denied it, by the C. of E. on pain of Suspension.* For let Men be never so pious, holy, and good, they must Kneel, or else be left in the same Predicament with the most prophane Drunkards, Swearers, &c. Yea much worse, (which I almost tremble to write;) for these, if they will but Kneel, cannot be denied; nor are they, that ever I heard of.

*Obj. 3. Dissenters Third Argument.* *The imposing and tying of Men to a particular Form of Worship, (without Authority from God) from which none shall vary, is an Invasion of GOD's Prerogative; and an Impeaching of his Wisdom; as if Men knew better than himself, what Form or manner of Service were fittest for him.* And what say you to this?

*Sol. 1.* You tell me of a Parliament, &c.

*Repl.* But I think *Dissenters* here meddle not with Parliaments, but with the Ch. of Engl. in their Canons and Book of Common Prayers, and other Rites and Ceremonies, &c.

*Sol. 2.* You say, I am a pleasant Spark indeed; and then ask me another grave Question. Tell me, *is Reading GOD's Word, Repeating his own Commandments, Professing our Christian Faith, Addressing our selves to him in his beloved Son's own Name, making Laws for him to obey?*

*Repl.* I answer, this is not making Laws for him no obey. But why did you ask this Question? I could also ask you Questions; but why should we trouble our selves and others, with asking and answering impertinent Questions? This looks like a *Blind*, to escape the Force of *Dissenters* Arguments unobserved. For they will say,



1. That it's Terms of Communion which God hath not commanded in his Word, and it's the Ch. of *Engl.*'s Form of Worship, which they mean, which is imposed; which God must have, or none; and which all must use, or be punished. This is making Laws, for God to obey.

2. For Reading of God's Word, and Praying in his own Son's Name, they do constantly so Worship God, because God himself hath enjoined it. But what's this to their Argument? I think I may promise, in behalf of *Dissenters*, If the C. of E. will impose no more on them, than these necessary things, they will chearfully obey, and thankfully comply.

3. But if God must not have his Worship in Baptism, unless the Minister do also Sign with the Sign of the Cross; and God shall not have his Worship in the Lord's Supper, unless Men will receive the Bread and Wine Kneeling; or if God shall not have his Worship in Prayer, unless the Minister say over so many *Pater-nosters*, and observe so many Ups and Downs, so many Cringes and different Postures, in one and the same Service; Standing up at the same Scripture read at one time, not at another; Saying Aloud at one time, not at another: Then Dissenters think this an Imposing upon God, making Laws for him to obey; and that with a Penalty; for he must have this, or none.

And 'till you have fairly answer'd this, I shall not think Dissenters so Ignorant as you represent them, "As not to be able by Arguments to  
" to Justify, *what you call*, their Superstitions, and Divisions from the  
" Established Church. *Sur. Imp. Pref. p. 1.*

I must again be tormented with answering a wise Question, or else I shall disoblige you, and forfeit the kind Appellation you give me, of Good Man. Friend, what's this Cramp-Question?

*Qu.* " Pray' tell me, (*this is mannerly*) what you call them, that make  
" God to be content with whatever comes next their Tongues-end?  
" *Lett. p. 15.*

*Ans.* 1. I answer, If Men Swear and Lie, or Engage themselves in the Name of God to do any unlawful thing, or rashly take an Oath, without any regard to the Matter, whether right or wrong; or whether they know what it is, or not: Yet rather than lose their Preferment, will say what comes next Tongues-end. I'll give you leave to name them; and it shall be a very hard one, if I consent not.

But not to escape in the dark, I will be open with you.

*Ans.* 2. If in their Prayers, any make God content with whatever comes next to their Tongues-end, and not from their Heart; I think, with your leave, they cannot make God content with them; for he requires Truth in the inward Parts. And if you will, call them Takers of God's Name in vain.

*Qu.* Yet another Question. " How I'll call them, that will not be at  
" the pains to compose a Sober Form of Worship for God, but too often  
" foam



## 16. *A Second Vindication of the Dissenters,*

“ foam out their own Shame, and yet are not ashamed to entitle it to,  
 “ but will needs have God admit it, for the Groans of his Spirit. P. 15.

*Ans. 1.* If you mean by Sober, a Grave and Serious Form of Prayer, if any Person do Compose a Form in apt and pertinent, intelligible Words, fit to express the Lawful Desires of the Heart, and to raise their Affections of Hope and Confidence in God, I would highly commend them. But if they should be so in love with their own Prayer, as to tie all others to their very Words, and none other; especially if they mix with their Form uncommanded Rites and Ceremonies, under a pretence of Decency; I would say they are proud and conceited, and assume an Authority that doth not belong to them.

*Ans. 2.* I did never hear any such Prayers, as you speak of; nor any affirm, that *what comes next Tongues-end*, or that *foam out their Shame*, and call them, *the Groans of the Spirit*. But I doubt too many say and read their Prayers, only at their Tongues-end; that have no more to think of, but how to Turn-over their Book-leaves, and Read right.

*Ans. 3.* If any Minister in Publick conceive a Prayer, and speak it in apt Words, (especially in Scripture-Words) with Humility and Reverence; and the Matter be Lawful, and in the Name of Christ offered up to the Throne of Grace, I would very heartily say *Amen* to it; and believe God will graciously accept it from an honest Heart.

And 'tis strange, that Ministers should be discouraged from Improving their Gifts, either in Composing or Conceiving such Prayers, as (I think) have been found by Experience, so much tending to Edification and Consolation; and (I suppose) so esteemed formerly, by the most serious Men of the C. of E. who, till of late, constantly used them in the Pulpit.

And some B's put it into their *Articles of Enquiry*, at their Visitations: *Do you know of any Parson, Vicar, or Curate, that never Pray before their Sermons?* The restraining of which, or discouraging at least, is thought by some one Occasion of so many raw Divines, weak and ignorant, while they need no other Qualification to perform their Office, than to be able to Read well; that being the chief Work. And for *Preaching*, the Reading of *Homilies* and other Mens *Sermons*, recommended by a R.R.B. to Young Ones, with a Grace, or with the Spirit of *Confidence*, (as a Dignitary used to Pray, in a composed Form) is sufficient. Tho' this is by others thought a Discouragement to *Industry*, and an Occasion of *Sloth*, *Idleness*, and worse.

*Obj. 4.* The Fourth Argument of *Dissenters* was this, Lev. p. 13: *Some of them think it no less than Sacrilege, to transfer the Ends of God's Sacraments to their own Appointments: For they think we are Baptized, in token, hereafter we shall not be ashamed, &c. And that Baptism is the Honourable Badge, whereby the Infant is Dedicated to the Service of Him that Died on the Cross; and should not be attributed to the Sign of the Cross.* What say you to this Argument of *Dissenters*?

*Ans. 1.*



*Ans.* 1. You say, *That Baptism is perfect without the Cross*, Can. 30. and you say true. But they will Reply,

*Repl.* 1. They therefore think it unlawful for Men to add something of their own, to that which is well and perfect already, according to Divine Appointment. Pray Friend, for once, let me ask a Question.

*Quest.* What is Crossing good for?

*Sol.* Why you'll say, *It's an Honourable Badge, whereby the Infant is Dedicated to the Service of Him that Died on the Cross.*

*Repl.* 2. This is another thing, *Dissenters* are offended at: That the same Honour should be put upon an aerial transient Sign of the Cross, of Men's Institution, that belongs to Baptism, a Sacrament of God's Institution. And they think it inexcusable Presumption and Arrogance, to set a Man's Badge, Cheek by Chaw, with Christ's Badge.

*Ans.* 3. You say, *The Canon refers not to the Sign of the Cross, more than Baptism.*

*Repl.* 3. But the Canon speaks only of the Sign of the Cross, when it says, *It's a Lawful outward Ceremony, and Honourable Badge, &c.*

*Dissenters* have objected, These Ends of Baptism should not be attributed to the Sign of the Cross. The Child is Dedicated already by Baptism, and therefore needs not, should not be Dedicated by the Cross.

*Ans.* 4. To this you say; *I should have given this malicious Reflection a hard Name, but that I pity my Friend's Ignorance.*

*Repl.* 4. Truly Mr. T. it's not well done to pity, and give no help to Answer *Dissenters*. I doubt something pinches, that provokes you. But may be I may have some Relief; for,

*Ans.* 5. You say, *Dedicate, among other things, is to Deliver up, with some Solemnity, what belongs to another. And so the Child, by the Sign of the Cross is solemnly Dedicated to Christ, to whom he doth belong by Baptism.*

*Rep.* 5. This is fine indeed: The Child is Dedicated by the Cross, who was before Dedicated by Baptism: So you take upon you to mend what was perfect before. And this is another Instance of your *impeaching* the Wisdom of G O D.

Lastly, *Dissenters* said, That Infants are Baptized, in Token hereafter, they shall not be Ashamed, &c. and so should not be Cross'd for the same thing. But you have Cross enough, and say nothing to this.

Now suppose a Person comes, with Authority, under the K.'s Broad Seal, to Execute an Office; and some Man should come and say, You shall not act, unless you have my Seal also. Would not this be accounted a Crime of an high nature?

And if you will not take it ill, I'll tell you of a fifth Argument. They cannot Read that which tells you, the Angel *Raphael* was the Son of *Ananias* the Great. An Angel, begotten by Man! and call it a Lesson; and justify, That it's either the pure Word of God, or, that which is agreeable to the same. But every body is in haste to over-run this. CHAP.



## C H A P. V.

Nor of Knavery; nor the Author Guilty  
of what Mr. T. accuses him of.

**A**NOTHER Thing charged by you on Dissenters, was, Knavery. To this you confess the Charge; but say, *So conscious is he, that he cannot acquit them of it, that in his Book he drops it.* P. 15.

Now I'll tell you, why I dropt it.

1. I found a General Charge of Knavery; *Sur.Imp.Pref.p.1. This their Knavery, as well as yours, was discovered.* But I found no particular Instances: And would you have me to forge for you Instances, to prove your General Charge.

2. I looked upon your word Knavery, as only *Blilinsgate-Rhetorick*; or a Malignant Reflection upon the Party; where I thought you very unjust, and therefore dropt it.

And you needed not to have given your self so much trouble, in searching your Book for all the Crimes, mentioned to be charged upon them; all are in the very first Page of the Preface of your *Sur. Impostor*. And the next Charge of *Injustice* also, in Reflecting upon the whole Party of Dissenters, for the Miscarriages of a few.

In *Pag. 15.* of your *Lett.* you say, *There is one thing remains, and that most plausible in all my Friend's Book, that I have charged on the whole Party, the Miscarriages of a few.* And farther you say, *Tho' my Friend lay this to my Charge, yet he produceth not one Instance.*

Now Mr. T. in Answer to this, I will shew you the Reason, why I accused you of laying the Miscarriages of a few on the whole Party; and let the Reader judge, whether I have wronged you.

The Reason of the Charge, was from your Words in the Preface, *Pag. 1. I must, say you, acquaint (viz. the Reader) that it's an old Juggle that your Predecessors the Puritans practised; but their Knavery, as well as yours, was discovered.* Here's Puritans and Dissenters, indefinitely. And *Pref. pag. 3. The Party, I imagine, ceased from such Religious Interludes. By which we have reason to suspect, the Party to Play-over-an Old Game.* And *P. 6.* which you mention: *If we be found tripping here-and-there, we expose not only our selves, but our whole Party; especially if the Leaders of them, as in the present Case, be conspiring with us, to promote the Intrigue.*

Now Mr. T. if you did not reflect upon the Party, what means these Expressions? I would not willingly put worst Constructions upon Words. But let any impartial Man that reads this, and observes the whole Scope of your Book besides, judge whether you be unjustly charged with reflecting on the whole Party, for the sake of a few. 2. The



2. The Reason why I brought no *Instance*, you had before. But are you not to blame, to call a Man a Thief, tho' you bring no Instances; and the more faulty, if you can find none? And yet you still go about to vindicate your Charge, and fall foul on the *Dissenters*, because they are not of your Mind, to *think the Demoniack was a Cheat*; (and your self charge not this upon *Dissenters* truly, unless you contradict your self) and that they did not by some Overt-Act, Censure it. As if every idle Book and Story, published by Men of C. of E. and not Censured by an Overt-Act, did involve them in the same Guilt with the Editors.

And you go on, here were 17 Ministers, one way or another, concerned in the Narrative. And what of all this? Here were two Compilers of the Narrative; but you charge them not with being the Authors of the Imposture, nor Contrivers of it.

Six you call *Assisters*. How are they assisting? Not to carry on an Intrigue or a Cheat, you are not so hardy as to affirm it. But they *Fasted* and *Pray'd*, or *Preach'd*, and what hurt in this?

Seven you call *Attestors*. But what do they attest? Not the Truth of the Imposture, but they believe the Truth of the Affidavits, and that D.'s strange Fits were by a Diabolical Power. And where is their Fault? Believing Men, upon their Oaths and Declarations, who were Eye-Witnesses, and whom they had no reason to suspect of Falshood; attesting nothing but what many others saw, and which your self deny not to be true.

Again, there might be 50 Hearers, and for ought I know, 500 Hearers and Seers, at one time or other: Must these be all *Dissenters*, and *Accessaries*? Some it may be, will say, It's so much liker to be no Cheat, when all was done above-board; and many, not only Seers and Hearers, but of the Witnesses, C. of E. Men.

And when all's done, how can you tell here was no Devil in the Case? (some Arguments looking that way, to prove no Devil, you disclaim) And whether you have any more, I find not.

And in fine, you Self quit all *Dissenters* from the Imposture, only so far as they were credulous, and were imposed upon; and as guilty of Pride, and Vain-glory, and Insincerity.

And if they were credulous, it's not the only Property of *Dissenters*; for B. Hall, you hear, was so; and tho' you pretend his Youth, when the thing was done; yet when he wrote his Book; he was old enough to judge; and it's probable, had seen or heard of *Harsnet's* Book.

But for their *Pride*, *Vain-glory*, and *Insincerity*, Lyes and Forgeries, which are all I remember you charge them with, (excepting what hath been spoken to already) if they, or any of them can be proved Guilty, (which will be hard for some of those Crimes to be, unless you could see into Hearts) then I shall heartily say Amen to your Prayer, *That GOD would open their Eyes, that they may repent*, (the almost only serious



Words I have met with in both your Books;) And I would pray farther, That God would Pardon them, tho' I doubt you will not.

And now, whether *Dugdale's* Tricks were from a Cheat, or a Distemper; or from Possession, Obsession, or all these, I am not concerned. But something here was strange, and unusual, and unaccountable, by what I can judge from what all Parties say. But in one thing I take my self concerned, which is, whether the Word *Obsession* be a Ch. of E. Word; for I had said, that it's to be found in *Can. 72*.

Mr. T. to this you say, *p. 9. The Dissenters finding the Pretence there Censured, out of that Spirit of Contradiction to the Ch. of E. which they mostly act by, (this is very charitable) may be supposed not only to make use of the Word, but the Imposture also, which is there condemned.* Here I confess I am bewildred, and by a croud of Words brought into such a Cloud, that I know not where to find you, or what you intend. Let the *Canon 72* be consulted, and I find not, either, 1. That they made a *Canon* to condemn *Obsession*, Word or Thing, no more than Possession; nor do they say it's a Popish Word. 2. Nor do they condemn Fasting and Prayer, upon such Occasion; but with the B.'s Licence, they may Fast and Pray; as some did in *Norwich*, (if I remember the Place) with a Boy that was supposed to be Obsessed or Possessed; (Here was Prayer, upon a Supposition: For how could they be sure?) with the Licence of the then B. of *Chester*. And now take heed of Belying your Mother. And I wish (not for any Virtue in a B.'s Licence) for Caution, *Dissenters* had acquainted the B. or some others of the Ch. of *Engl.* and advised with more Learned Physicians, about this Case.

*Pag. 10.* You charge me unjustly, Mr. T. in saying, I would make the World believe, that you were intimate to *W. C.*'s Intrigue. And tho' you never saw the Man, you might hear of his Hypocritical Carriage at *Kirkham*, where I suppose you have some Relations. And the things were not done in Secret, but generally known, and spoken of. And I had heard you were informed of his Tricks, about that Business; and withal, that you said you would inform the B. which was honest. And it never entred into my Thought, that you were accessory to the Intrigue. I see your Eyes are not yet Cured, Prejudice is powerful.

Again, I had said, *P. 18. Lev. The B. of C. would never have connived at W. C. if he had known such things of him, &c. much less collated him.* Here you catch me; for it seems he was not Collated. Now I'll easily confess my Ignorance and Mistake: For he being in the Place near two Years, I thought it rational to believe he was Collated, however the other word Connived you acknowledge. And if *W. C.* gave any good Satisfaction, or did any Penance proportionable to his Offences committed, so little a while before he went thither, I am glad of it. And being gone, you shall hear no more of him from me, farther than in my own neces-

necef-



necessary Vindication. But there are some Passages in your *Lett.* p. 12. you charge on me, as an Untruth; viz. That I would insinuate a Licence to another Cure, viz. *N. Chappel*; Mr. Taylor, this is your Untruth. I said he was Introduced; you say this is *notoriously false*. Pray Sir, what is false? Did he not Preach at *N. Chappel*? and some tell me, sometimes at *Manchester Church*. But say you, *Ibid.* All that was done, was at the *Importunity of the Presbyterian Party*. You here take a Travellers Liberty. For the *Presbyterians* at *Newton* kept up their distinct Meetings all the time, and so did the *Presbyterians* in *Mott Parish*, and do still to this day. And is this like the *Presb. Party* importuning for him or Grey?

And then follows a doleful Story of a Vicar, &c. and I can tell you of another Story, “Of one that in a Vicar’s Church sat Weeping, while the Communion-Office was in hand; to see the Symbols of Christ’s Body broken, and his Blood shed; tho’ he must not eat of that Bread; and drink of that Cup, because he durst not Kneel.” And what good Man had not cause to be grieved, when he durst not administer to such a Pious Man, as I believe he esteemed this to be, for fear of Suspension?

Now I return to your P. 18. and I am accused of bringing in an Argument, which you say is Mine, not Yours. To this, I would not willingly misrepresent what you have written, nor would I mistake your meaning; but I’ll tell you what led me so to understand you, and if I be mistaken, I’ll not persist in it. You, P. 32. of *Surey Imp.* undertook to shew two things.

1. That *Dugd.* was not possessed by the Devil.

2. That if he was, he found no Benefit at all by those erroneously Religious Offices that they performed for him.

1. To the first I expected your Proof, and you go over his Tricks, &c. and at last conclude, P. 56. “I can find nothing in our *Surey-Spark*, from whence we may conclude him a *Demoniack*. But then to gratify Ministers, I will suppose he was so; and shew,

2. “That he found no Benefit by their Prayers, &c. a very bold Attempt. Now how do you shew this? First, you bring in *Dicky* as a true Prophet, who had said, “They were not able to perform what they had promised. Then you bring in *Dugd.* the Father, saying, “That after the Ministers had left him, he had several Fits. Then *Walmesley* says, “Notwithstanding M. J. C. and others Preach’d and Pray’d by R. his Fits continued as violent as before, to the last Fit.” Upon which you make this Inference, P. 57. “Doth this look like casting out the Devil? Now if this be not your Argument to prove your Assertion, I find none, viz. “To prove, That *Dick* found no Benefit by their Prayers. Which was to be Proved. So you undertake to shew, what you either cannot, or will not.

Again, I had said, What were those Offices which you call *erroneously Religious*, were they Fasting and Prayers? If you exclude Fasting from being Religious Worship, (Erroneously there is among the *Errata*) *Dissenters* will not quarrel with you.



To this you have a witty Reflection, P. 19. which I'll leave to those that are disposed to make merry with your Rhetorick : But must tell you, *Dissenters* are not against Fasting, to keep under the Body ; nor as a Help in Religious Worship. And methinks this might have passed, when many C. of E. will not allow Preaching to be Religious Worship.

Your next Witticism is ; " If it was conceived in a Barn, *viz.* Prayers, " it was the fittest Place for them to be begotten in.

Good Sir, is the Worship of God any worse, because in a Barn ? Did not *David* worship God acceptably on a Barn-Floor ? 2 *Sam.* 24. 18, 19. Was not a Stable the first place where Christ, after his Incarnation, was worshipped.

Again, I am here blamed, for not having Wit to stop at a Proverb, but marr'd it with an Explanation. And indeed here you are in the right ; for if the Explanation had been mine, it had been marr'd.

But I believe *E. Johnston* your Publisher, can assure you, (and I wonder he did not) that presently after he had received the *Lev.* he had a Note of *Errata's*, one of which was this ; P. 26. l. 19. After *Sands*, add an absurd Inference, *vid.* Ray's *Proy.* p. 195. *Ibid.* dele the four next Lines, which were not in the *M. S.* And who put them there, I cannot tell.

Yet P. 21. I have a Flirt for something in my *Lett.* P. 27. *That I am blind as Tobit.* I perceive something pleaseth not ; but you have the Prudence to pass it over, and are in haste, as well as another of your Friends. And for Dr. *Chew's* Certificate I need not tarry, for *Dick* never had Fit after the first Dose.

But you say, P. 22. I have a *fling* at the *Largeness of Dioceses*, in *Lev.* P. 18. To this you say, *But he would do well to consider, whether he doth not by this spit in the Face of Christ, (God forbid) and his Apostles ; whose Oecumenical Provinces were something larger than the largest of our Dioceses.*

Mr. T. are you here in earnest ? Or you thought to try whether you could put a Trick upon your ignorant Friend ; if this latter, you should not have *jested* at the Name of *Christ*, when you *bow* at the Name *Jesus*.

But if you are in earnest, to justify your large Dioceses, by the Examples of Christ and his Apostles, then you have spun a fine Thread for your self and many of your worthy Brethren. For if B's must have as large Dioceses as Christ and his Apostles, as a *H.* 8. would make merry with a great Revenue of B's Lands, and have something to say ; One B. in *England* is enough, and more than needs, when Thirteen will serve all the World. And then you and many of your worthy Brethren are like never to wear Lawn Sleeves.

Yet I am not so wedded to my own Opinion, but if you can find One to succeed Christ in his *Oecumenical Province*, of the same *Natures, Gifts, Wisdom, Abilities* and *Authority*, for the Performance of the Function, I will not spit in his Face, but submit. And



And if you can find 12 Men with the same *Commission*, endowed with the same extraordinary *Gifts*, and so filled with the *Spirit* of GOD, as the *Apostles*, I'll submit, and we'll be Friends still.

In the same, P.22. you are in a Huff; and I observe, where I need most of your Help, you are most out of Humor.

I told you, Lev. p. 18. I had a Scruple about a Prayer in the *Litany*, used generally in K. J.'s time, who was a *Papist*, viz. *That it may please thee to keep and strengthen in the true worshipping of thee, in righteousness and holiness of life thy Servant, our most gracious K. and Governour.* And the Reason of my Scruple was, because *Popish Worship* is Idolatrous; and it seemed hard for *Protestants*, to Pray that he might be kept and strengthened in *Idolatry*.

To this you say, *Is Popery such a mass of Idolatry, that there is no piece of true Worship in it? Do they not worship God, &c. And was not this that True Worship we prayed God to keep him in?*

Here you are in haste again, but I must tarry by it; for my Scruple is increased, by multiplied Thoughts of some Things following.

1. By the by, I observe how tenderly you deal by the *Papists*; their *Worship* is true, when *Dissenters* is erroneously Religious *Worship*. But let that pass.

2. I have been told, (but not learned it from Mr. *Frankl.*) that the *Popish Worship* is Idolatrous.

3. I have been told also by more than *Dissenters*, that Idolatrous *Worship* mixed with something of True *Worship*, doth defile the whole. And their *Liturgy* is Idolatrous, as denominated from the worst Part, (and perhaps the greatest) as a Drop of Poison in a Cup of Wine.

4. Doth not the Church of Rome *Worship* by their *Breviary* and *Mass-Book*, as the C.of E. by their *Common Prayer*, which they call *Divine Service*? And is not their *Missal* and *Breviary* Idolatrous *Worship*? Tho' in some part of it they pray to God in the Name of Christ; tho' it may be, oftener to Saints and Angels, or to God through their Intercession. And is this a sufficient Reason to justify *Protestants* Praying to keep them. and strengthen them in the true worshipping? &c. Yes, when it's safe for you to drink a Glass of Wine with Poison in it, because it's but a Drop; but there is a great deal of Good Wine.

5. Do you think this of yours, was the Sence of the first Composers of this Petition; that it might be Prayed for a *Popish K. or Q.*?

6. But here is implied a positive Assertion, that K. J. worships God truly, and not a bare Supposition. But if it were but upon Supposition, that you Pray thus for him, then it's Superstition at the best, according to your own Doctrine.

7. A *Papist* will say, If our *Worshipping God* be such, that you can lawfully pray God to keep and strengthen us in it; why did you separate from



## 24 *A Second Vindication of the Dissenters,*

from our Worship? You'll say, We separate not, so far as it's true. And so will *Dissenters* say, We separate not from Ch. of *Engl.* so far as their VVorship is good; only from uncommanded Rites and Ceremonies.

8. Did you not mean, when you Prayed for C. II. (best of K's said many) a Protestant K. that he might be kept and strengthened in the true Protestant Worship, or the Common Prayer Worship, and not turn from it. And must not the words still have the same sence?

*Ob.* But farther you say, *Was not thus Praying for him, the best means to reclaim him from his false Worship?* A means, the best means, thus to Pray.

*Sol.* 1. This might be pretended a means to keep him from turning *Turk* or *Infidel*, if the Prayer had been, to keep and strengthen him in the Christian VVorship and Religion.

2. Was not this liker to harden him in his false Worship? when you at the same time acknowledge his VVorshipping, without *Is* or *And*s, to be true, and pray that he may be strengthened in it.

3. VVould not this be an odd way to convert a *Papist*, by praying thus with him, and for him? *Lord keep him in the true worshipping of thee*; might he not say, *I thank you Sir for your good Prayers, for I perceive I am already in the true Worshipping of God, and so have no need to change my Church.*

4. But was this the *best Means*? verily I think you are not so ignorant, but you can readily think of many better Means. And in my Mind, the one honest *Priest* of the C. of *E.* found out a much better Means, when he changed those words into such as these; *That God would direct, and bring him into, and keep and strengthen him, in the true worshipping of him.* In a word, Would it not be a strange hearing, for Men in the *Liturgy* to Pray for the *Pope*, that God would keep and strengthen him in the true worshipping of him; and to say this is the best means to reclaim him. The *Israelites* might thus have prayed for *Jeroboam*, for *Abaz*, &c. yea, may you not thus pray for the *Turk*, that God would keep and strengthen him, &c. If you say he doth not worship God truly; yes, may it be answered, he owns the true God, and worships him. And this is the best Means to reclaim him from that part of his Worship that is false.

The Sum of all is, If Men have but the Conscience to Subscribe to they know not what, that they never read; or may have the liberty to put their own fancied Meanings upon things commanded, and subscribed to; they may subscribe to the *Alchoran*, and make a shift to put a plausible Sence upon it; (as *S. Clara*, who makes the *Articles* of the C. of *E.* agree with the *Articles* of the Council of *Trent*;) and it seems may also lawfully pray for the *Turk* and *Pope*; and say to God, *That it may please thee to keep and strengthen them in the true worshipping of thee*, &c. And according to Mr. T. as the best means to reclaim them from their false VVorship.

Your



Your last thing observable, is P. 23. where you justify your self for all your *ill Words and hard Speeches*; from the *Examples and Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles*.

Really Mr. T. this is a *Boldness* that some tender-hoof Men (as they call them in derision) would startle and boggle at.

What, compare your self with *Christ* and his *Apostles*? I'll say this, when you know *Mens Hearts* as *Christ* did, when you have the *Spirit of Discerning*, as the *Apostle* had; you shall have my consent, to call Men *Hypocrites* and *Insincere*, &c. Provided always you be not too *hasty*, as some of the *Disciples* were, *Luke* 9. 54, 55. and be sure it be in a *Good Cause*; *Gal.* 4. 18. and that you have a *Call* to it; lest some of your *Brethren* should blame you for *arrogating* to your self, from *Tit.* 1. 10, 13. that which they account the proper *Work* of your *Diocesan*. And if you have a *Mind* to assume the *Authority of Christ*, to call Men *Satan*, (for it seems you'll allow *Peter* to have a *Devil*, tho' *Dugd.* none,) It may possibly be as good a *warrant* for others to call you a *Devil*; that is, a *False-Accuser*, or *Slanderver*. 2 *Tim.* 3. 3.

## CHAP. VI.

### ANSWER, to P. S.

I Am now arrived at your P. S. and you produce Two Letters, to Justify the R. R. the L. B. of C. &c. and Mr. Gr.

Mr. T. whatever you insinuate, I have a *tenderness* for the *Reputation* of that worthy Person; and therefore when I understood that a *Lover* of him had sent him Word, That it was not for his Honour to suffer W. C. &c. I hoped it might be a sufficient *Caution*. And therefore in the *Lev.* I did lay the *Blame* where I think it still lies; viz. On those that should have been more *Faithful* to him; and I am the more confirmed in my *Opinion*, by these very Letters you produce, in *Justice* to the B. and to Mr. Gray.

For in the first Lett. who this R. T. is, or who His *Worship* is, I am not concerned: But I suppose he is not the *Presbyterian Party* you spake of at P. 11. At whose Request, the B. admitted G. to the Order of *Deacon*.

But whoever he is, I doubt he is *Partial*; he told the *Bishop* of Gr's Crime, but did he tell him of any *Satisfaction* he had made, for so *Publick a Scandal*? Yes, he turned *Conformist*, and all on a Push skipped over to the C. of E. doubtless by immediate *Inspiration*, by the *Hopes* of better *Preferment* than among *Dissenters*. Is this *Satisfaction*?

This R. T. reflects on *Dissenters*, and therefore cannot be thought their *Representative* to the B.

But he formerly *Observed*, (I perceive he's a *Man of Observation*, and may be an *Observable Man* too) when some weak or debauch'd Minister served in the Place, there was but little *Reflection*: A *Debauch'd*, and no *Reflection*; it may be, not by his *Society*; but there might by *Dissenters*, sorrowing and mourning, for what they could not *Reform*: Nor when a weak Minister; truly a weak Minister might be *Pious* and *Godly*, and might do his best, and then *Charity* forbad *Reflection*.

But now Mr. Gray, a very able Minister, (sure this is some fit Judge) he was not reflected at *Thirske*; no, they knew nothing of him, but as he appeared to be a *zealous Dissenter*, 'Till he had a *Design* for *Mot. and Conformity*. And what then? They reflect on him, that is, they called to Mind his former *Offence*, for which he had never testified any *Repentance*.

Let's see then what the next Letter will do, for this is *Small Game*? the Letter is Mr. Gray's own.

1. But is this fair, to admit a Man to be *Witness* in his own Cause? Altho', Upon the severest Examination, as to his *Morals*, P. 11. of the Letter, Would he *Accuse Himself*? This marrs the *Proof*.

2. This very Letter of his, is a *Ground of Suspicion*.

1. He acknowledges not the *Justice* of his *Censure*.

2. He



2. He calls the *telling* of his *Faults*, Calumnies belched out against him.
3. He saith (for ought I know) a manifest Untruth; that the *B. of Ch.* is struck at for his sake.
4. He falsly suggests the Cause of divulging his *Crime*: For was it not divulged where he was not known before; and how could it be divulg'd where he secretly sculk'd?
5. He falsly and spitefully reflects upon *Dissenters*; and says, he might have lived quietly, if he had not Conformed.

1. But did he *Live quietly* when he was a *Dissenter*, without *Censure* for his *Sin*?

2. Had they not cause to reflect on him, who in so long time never signified his *Repentance* to them that Censured him.

6. He charges *Dissenters* roundly with a Position I never heard, nor read; and have reason to suspect his *Veracity*. However, doth Recriminating Justify him?

7. He saith, he fears it's *Malice*, more than *Matter*. What Impudence is this? Is it *Malice*, who gave thee Authority to Judge Mens Hearts? *More than Matter*? Was there not a *Cause*, was not the *Crime* open, notorious, scandalous; and yet no *Matter*?

Now Mr. T. are these things Signs of *Repentance*, and of an humble and broken Spirit?

And yet after all, if the Man be sincerely a true *Penitent*, and Live well, and Preach well, I shall say, *The Lord give a Blessing, and Success to his Labours; for the Conversion of Sinners, and the Edification of Saints.* So far am I from envying any Pious, Holy Minister, whether of the *Ch. of Engl.* or *Dissenters*; and very heartily will obey your *Canon.* Gal. 6. 1.

But Mr. T. you have a strange Comment upon that Text. *I will not, say you, reflect upon my Friend, this is honest; tho' if he be a Man named to me, (I am confident, no Man living but my self can be sure, who he is you call your Friend, but your Friend himself; no not the Transcriber of the Levite.) It's supposed he is as much as the Scots-Man interested in the Lenity of this Canon. It's supposed! Here was doubtless some Reluctancy.* But out it comes.

Mr. T. I was astonished when I read this; a Story came into my Mind, of a *French B.* taken by the *English* in *Armour*. The *Pope* sends to the *K. of England*, to release his Son. Whereupon the *K.* sends his *Armour* to the *Pope*, and ordered this Question to be asked, *Is this thy Son's Coat?* To which the *Pope* answered, *He's not my Son, but the Son of Mars;* and leaves him to the *K.* to do with him what he pleased. I'll refer it to your *Diocesan*, to apply it. And for my self, I have need enough of Indulgence of *Paul's Canon*, yet not in *Gray's Case*. I Appeal to the Righteous Judge of all the World.

But for you my Friend, if I were your *Diocesan*, I would Reprove you sharply; but I'll do it in the Spirit of Meekness.

For ought you know, you have one way or other wounded more innocent Persons, than *Samson* did with the jaw-bone. For there are many Conjectures of the Author of that which is called *Lanc. Lev.* Some say it's Sir such a One, and Name, others a Learned and moderate C. of E. Man, others M. D. and others a Bookish Country Gentleman; others Father it on no fewer than Five or Six Dissenting Ministers, and name all according to each Man's Fancy. So many as these are, you have exposed them and their Reputation. Besides, occasioned the Sin and Censures of so many, as believe any of these to be the Author; who live, some of them 20 Miles distant from one another. Now how many may from hence be filled with Unchristian and Uncharitable Surmises of innocent Persons; especially, such as are willing to believe any thing that's Ill, of the *Dissenter*?

Good Sir, retire, and think what you have done. (For I profess, I never heard the least Charge of this nature, against any that are reputed Authors, and as I know my self, innocent; so I believe are all the rest.) And read the Author of *The Duty of Man, of the Government of the Tongue, and The B. of G. of Revenge*; and the Lord give you a more meek, humble, and charitable Heart.

MAY 20. 1698.

F I N I S.